From:
 Lisa Kusnierz

 To:
 Sivers, Eric

 Subject:
 RE: roads form

 Date:
 08/24/2010 10:37 AM

Can we make an assumption based on the crossings on those roads?

Lisa Kusnierz U.S. EPA, Montana Office 10 West 15th Street, Suite 3200 Helena, MT 59626 Kusnierz Lisa@epa.gov (406) 457-5001

▼ "Sivers, Eric" ---08/24/2010 09:48:06 AM---Lisa- I have the crossings re-evaluated. However, the parallel segments are proving problematic. S

From: "Sivers, Eric" <ESivers@mt.gov>
To: Lisa Kusnierz/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 08/24/2010 09:48 AM Subject: RE: roads form

> I have the crossings re-evaluated. However, the parallel segments are proving problematic. Since the county has a bunch of roads with maintenance responsibilities 'TBD', I can't conclusively break them all down for the summary stats. Eric Sivers Eric Sivers Hydrogeologist Source Water Protection Section Watershed Management Section Montana DEO 406.444.0471 406.444.6836 (fax) esivers@mt.gov ----Original Message--------Original Message---From: Kusnierz.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Kusnierz.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov]
> Sent: Thursday, August 12, 2010 9:06 AM
> To: kdraper@wet-llc.com
> Cc: Sivers, Eric
> Subject: RE: roads form That's correct that the crossings should be labeled prior to the field assessment and that we don't need the ownership for all crossings before then. Ideally I would like to have it to help evaluate our sampling design relative to the ownership distribution, but based on our random site selection process (and that Eric doesn't have time to deal with this right now), I'll just assume that we're covered. The SAP is usually modified after the field work into as "as-built" SAP so we can just incorporate the dataset ownership changes at that point. Lisa Kusnierz U.S. EPA, Montana Office 10 West 15th Street, Suite 3200 Helena, MT 59626 Kusnierz.Lisa@epa.gov (406) 457-5001 ----> Date: | >-----RE: roads form -----

Eric,

Thank you for the great explanation. I know enough to ask a lot of questions in the GIS world but I don't work with it first-hand.

It is my understanding from DEQ recommendations after the Little Blackfoot Roads Assessment that we need to uniquely label all of the crossings prior to the field assessment. The label does not need to include information

regarding ownership. Secondly, if a crossing cannot be assessed in the field, we assess the closest crossing (assuming it is of similar nature, in this case gravel gravel, paved or native). Ownership will not be a part of that decision making process. Thank you! Kim ----Original Message----From: Sivers, Eric [mailto:ESivers@mt.gov] Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2010 2:57 PM To: kdraper@wet-llc.com: Kusnierz.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov Subject: RE: roads form Yes, but with a caveat. There are no 'TBD sites' yet in the layer of 438 ossings, because that attribute comes from the Gallatin County roads ayer. The crossings were generated with the statewide framework layer. Therefore, any crossings in Park County (Lower Jackson Creek) will have ownership/maintenance pulled from the 'System' field of the statewide layer layer (assuming that seems to make sense). And for whatever reason, the roads don't agree between the two layers in a number of cases, upper Dry Creek in particular. So, from the above, some more GIS work is necessary to reassign the ownership/maintenance attribute to the entire population of 438. I have already reassigned this attribute with the SAP/fieldwork subset, of course.

I'm new to the roads assessment process, but do you need the TPA-wide summary stats prior to going into the field? I don't think I'll be able to to tackle this before next week. Eric Sivers Hydrogeologist Source Water Protection Section Watershed Management Section Montana DEQ 406.444.0471 406.444.6836 (fax) esivers@mt.gov ----Original Message----From: Kim Draper [mailto:kdraper@wet-llc.com] Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2010 1:54 PM To: Kusnierz_Lisa@epamail.epa.gov; Sivers, Eric Subject: RE: roads form Hi! Thank you for all of the emails. Lisa - I really like the DEQ form. It is nice because an $8.5 \mathrm{xll}$ sheet fits nicely on a clipboard in the field. We currently use 11x17 forms. Here are the changes I will include with the SAP:

1) update selected road crossings to reflect new ownership categories;

2) update overall statistics per new ownership categrories;

3) update selected road crossings from TED to private and state;

4) include text that the DEQ form may be used to evaluate crossings and
parallel segments; and
5) update naming convention to reflect new ownership categories. Eric - will you assign a maintenance / ownership class to all TBD sites within the 438 crossings in order to run statistics? If so, may we use that layer to name all of the sites before we go into the field? Thanks, Kim ----Original Message---From: Kusnierz.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov [
mailto:Kusnierz.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2010 1:15 PM
To: Kdraper@wet-llc.com
Subject: Fw: roads form Here's the most recent version of the roads form DEO created. Lisa Kusnierz U.S. EPA, Montana Office 10 West 15th Street, Suite 3200 Helena, MT 59626 Kusnierz.Lisa@epa.gov (406) 457-5001

(See attached file: Roads_Crossing_Field_Form_05_06_10.pdf)(See attached file: Roads_Crossing_Field_Form_05_06_10.xls)